



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

SOME POINTS IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM. III. SOME SECONDARY FEATURES. By REV. PROF. V. H. STANTON, D.D., in *The Expositor* for April 1893, pp. 256-266.

The resemblances in substance, order, and language, broadly considered, between the first three gospels and the matter common to Matthew and Luke, but not found elsewhere, are certainly primary features of the synoptic problem. Not all others would be admitted by all to be secondary, but the following seem to be fairly so reckoned.

1. Recognizing that the first and third evangelists used a document substantially identical with our Mark, it still remains a question whether there was not some reciprocal action, by which Mark derived something from Matthew and Luke. Here we touch the question whether there was an original Mark different in any degree from our Mark.

2. The "doublets, repetitions, and inconsistencies," are reckoned by F. P. Badham as primary features, and his arguments merit attention. But as he has apparently gained no adherents as yet, it is evident that the doublets, etc. are not yet generally recognized as of primary importance. The whole argument, moreover, involves the inconsistency of assuming that doublets when occurring in the same work are a sign of difference of source, but when occurring in different works, must have come from the same source.

3. The discourse passages which being common to Mark and the other synoptists, more particularly Matthew, are briefer in Mark than in the other evangelists, merit special attention. Weiss does not, however, appear to have made any converts to his view, that these were derived by all the evangelists from the Logia. Indeed, this explanation is arbitrary and unattractive. A more probable explanation is, that Mark is here as elsewhere, original, but that the other two wove in additional matter from the other source, or substituted similar matter from that other source. The latter is indeed, for several reasons, more probable. But if so, then "the assumption which many critics are wont to make, that wherever there is identity of form in two of the gospels, there must be direct dependence upon one another, or upon a common document, is without foundation."

4. In sections common to all three of the synoptists, when two agree verbally as against a third, Mark is almost always one of the two. Yet exceptionally Matthew and Luke agree as against Mark. These are the crucial cases for deciding whether the third gospel is directly dependent on the first.

Holtzmann at first explained them by reference to the original Mark, but has since abandoned that view. Weiss has recourse to the Logia. Simons bases on them an argument for a dependence of the third evangelist on the first gospel, but only by *reminiscence*, not by copying. But none of these views substantiate themselves. The phenomena are explicable by reference to three causes. (*a*) Accidental coincidence between the first and the third evangelists in their adaptation of Mark. (*b*) Tradition known to both, leading both to make the same modifications. (*c*) Assimilation by copyists, too early to be eliminated by textual criticism. These explanations are not offered as adequate of themselves to account for the great mass of close resemblances, amounting in some cases to identity, in the matter contained in Matthew and Luke. They may, however, modify our view of these parallels.

This article continues Professor Stanton's sober but forcible presentation of objections to the most popular current view of the synoptic problem. The chief interest of the present article is probably in its fourth point, and to many it will seem doubtful whether the causes which Professor Stanton names are adequate to account for the facts, yet it is certainly fair to recognize that the facts themselves are narrow in scope and quite exceptional in character.

E. D. B.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY: III. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By Rev. Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D., in *The Expositor* for March, 1893.

Paul's success as a gentile apostle speedily precipitated a bitter conflict touching the question: Must heathen converts submit to Jewish rites in order to obtain the benefits of salvation and of fellowship with Christians of Hebrew extraction? The trouble began at the Jerusalem conference. The settlement then reached was neither radical nor final, and left room for misunderstandings, and for the development of opposite tendencies. The collision between Paul and Peter at Antioch revealed the existence of these tendencies. The controversy between Paul and the Judaists passed beyond circumcision to other questions of grave import. To set aside circumcision was virtually to annul the whole law, argued Paul's opponents; and this he admitted. Thereon the Judaists raised the question: Who is this man who dares to teach so blasphemous a doctrine against the law of Moses? He calls himself an apostle: what right has he to the name? He is not one of the twelve. None but they can authoritatively interpret the mind of the Lord. Paul could not shirk the question, but felt bound to show his authority. But that question disposed of, still another remained: On Paul's view of the law, what about the election of Israel? Could that be a true interpretation of Christianity which cancelled this? These three questions respecting the law, the apostolate, and the election, seem to mark distinct stages in the controversy. The Epistle to the Galatians is occupied predominantly with the first of these three themes, the two Epistles to the Corinthians with the second, and the Epistle to the Romans, in

the matter peculiar to it, with the third. This may also be assumed to be the order in which these epistles were actually written.

The very first sentence in the Epistle to the Galatians shows that something had occurred to disturb the spirit of the writer. His independence and authority as a teacher had been assailed. After announcing the theme of the Epistle, salvation by grace and not by circumcision, 1:6-10, he sets himself in a very earnest way to demonstrate his entire freedom from all dependence on the other apostles, 1:11; 2:21. This personal defence may be regarded as parenthetical, but is very important in its bearing on the main design of the Epistle. It consists of three parts, the first showing that Paul was not indebted to the other apostles for his knowledge of Christ and of the gospel (1:11-24); the second, that he was in no wise controlled by them in regard to his preaching of the gospel (2:1-10); the third, that so far from any of the apostles prescribing to him what he should preach, he had remonstrated with Peter himself in regard to his inconsistency (2:11-21). This third division contains also an epitome of Paulinism. The main part of the Epistle, chapters 3-5, may be summed by three phrases: Legalism condemned, chapter 3; Christian liberty asserted, chapters 4:1-5:6; Abuse of Christian liberty censured, chapter 5:13-26. In proof of the first of these points Paul appeals to the experience of the Galatian converts (3:1-5), and to the history of Abraham (6-9), shows that the law brings only cursing (10-14), argues from the date of the Sinaitic legislation the superiority of the promise to the law (15-18), and exhibits the functions of the law (19-20). In proof of the second point he brings out the epoch-making significance of the advent of Jesus in the general religious history of the world, since with his advent commenced the era of grace, of liberty, of sonship, of the new humanity which is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ (4:1-5). This is one of the greatest thoughts in the whole range of Paulinism. It is plainly the duty of him who lives in this new era to enter into its spirit, and subjectively to realize its lofty ideal, to be free indeed, as a son of God arrived at his majority, and not to return again to bondage to the weak and beggarly elements, whether of Jewish legalism or of Pagan superstition, from which it was the very purpose of Christ's coming to redeem him (4:6-20). Paul commends his logical argument and pathetic appeal to the acceptance of his readers by the allegory of Sarah and Hagar and their sons. It is to be taken as poetry rather than logic, meant not so much to convince the reason as to captivate the imagination. With passionate earnestness this true son of the Jerusalem above, appeals once more to the Galatians to stand fast in their Christ-bought liberty, and not to become reentangled in a yoke of bondage, and warns them that that must be the inevitable effort of their submitting to the rite of circumcision (5:1-4). Then follows a brief, sententious statement of the healthy normal Christian attitude on all such questions as were in debate (5-6). On the apostle's warning against the abuse of liberty, little need be said. He traces the source of abuse to the *flesh* and finds the antidote in

walking in the Spirit (chapter 5:13-26). After the speech to Peter, the post-script (6:11-17) is the most characteristic thing in the Epistle. The sentiments are as unmistakably Pauline as the penmanship. Here is no elaborate reasoning, whether of the ex-rabbi or of the theological doctor, but abrupt, impassioned, prophetic utterances of deepest convictions.

A remarkably luminous exposition of the leading features of the great controversy precipitated in the early church by Paul's work among the gentiles. From this point of view the writer presents an admirable analysis of the Epistle to the Galatians and of Paul's apologetic in behalf of Christian liberty and against legal bondage. Any student of the New Testament would confer a lasting benefit on himself by procuring this series of articles for detailed study.

P. A. N.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT. By Prof. C. H. TOY, in *The New World*, March, 1893, pp. 121-141.

Israel is no exception to the rule, that ancient peoples know little or nothing trustworthy of their beginnings. The narratives cannot be regarded as properly historical since the earliest of them dates from the ninth century, and we have no knowledge of trustworthy written documents behind them. The patriarchal history, when analyzed, shows that it is a late construction of tradition, partly legendary, out of harmony with succeeding history. The descent of Jacob into Egypt is part of this legendary story. The Egyptian coloring in Genesis is explicable from the knowledge of Egypt probably possessed by the writer in the eighth or ninth centuries.

The national history of Israel really begins with Exodus. The Egyptian residence and escape has been regarded as the force which moulded the nation into form. Is there any evidence to substantiate this view? What influence on Israelitish life and thought was exercised by Egypt? The strength of the tradition preserved in the Old Testament is proof that the Israelites did dwell for a time on the border of Egypt. But for Abraham's Egyptian sojourn there is little proof, as Abraham's person is at present an unsolved problem. That Jacob and his family descended into Egypt contains a germ of historic truth, but in Goshen the Hebrew tribes were still in a very loose, nomadic condition. Moses did in some sense organize them, but there can have been little systematic or thorough-going organization, for the Book of Judges is against any such assumption. There is little light on what tribes of Israel were in Goshen, probably none in their later form. The hints in the Bible favor growth by a mixture of tribes and peoples.

Outside the Bible there is little satisfactory information. The "Aperu" of the monuments is too doubtful. The identification of Egyptian cities like Pithom is of little service. It only allows that the Hebrews were pressed into service by Egypt, were a subject race, but adds nothing to our knowledge of their social and religious condition. Manetho's narrative is equally obscure. The religious movement of Amenhotep IV., ascribed to Semitic influences,

can have had nothing to do with the Hebrews. The use of "Yaudu" and "Chabiru" in the Tel Amarna despatches, is as yet too uncertain to make it available, likewise the terms Joseph-El and Jacob-El in the list of Totmes III. Thus the information from all sources is scanty and indefinite. The pre-Canaanite period of Hebrew history can hardly be reconstructed. Thus the narrative of the "Exodus" has an historical interest for the times when the narrative was written down, but hardly for the events of which it treats. The "Exodus" was important as the beginning of a national life for Israel, but it did not probably differ from the other nomadic movements of the time. Chronology cannot give any satisfactory answer as to its date, or, indeed, as to the date of any of the pre-Canaanite Egyptian relations of Israel.

As nomads on the borders of Egypt, the Israelite tribes had no effective intellectual, or religious intercourse with Egypt. It is doubtful whether they spoke or understood the Egyptian language. Certainly their religious conceptions were different. As the nation developed later we find no place for Egyptian religious influences. Neither the bull-worship of Jeroboam, nor the statements of Ezekiel 8:10, really show the presence of Egyptian ideas. Likewise there is little probability of the Egyptian origin of the tribe of Levi, or of the Ark, or of the "urim and thummim." Moreover, the differences between the two religions appear in the monotheistic idea, which in Egypt was the possession of the few, while in Israel it appears in the worship of Jehovah as national god. The absence of any developed idea of the future life in Israel, compared with the highly wrought out doctrine among the Egyptians, favors a similar conclusion. Egypt, therefore, did not discernibly affect Hebrew religious thought, or definitely influence the beginnings of the Israelitish religion.

Most students would conclude that this article does not do justice to the patriarchal history of the Hebrews. Abraham, even when treated on the strictest scientific principles, yields to Kittel, for example, something more than a negative unsolved problem. To be sure, it is better to be thoroughly honest than to bend from the truth in the interest of apologetics. Yet there is danger sometimes of being too doubtful, of enveloping everything in a mist of uncertainty and indefiniteness, as seems to be the case here. To come to the main topic of discussion; on *a priori* grounds it is reasonable to conclude that the Hebrews could not have lived so long, even on the borders of Egypt, and not have been influenced by its higher civilization. This conclusion is seen to have a good deal in its favor when the details of the biblical narratives relating to Egypt are carefully examined. The ninth century writer of Genesis was exceedingly familiar with the Egyptian life and customs of a thousand or twelve hundred years before his time. Was such knowledge as this common in Israel, and yet did no influences from Egypt enter there? The religious differences mentioned by Professor Toy are striking, and as far as they go, conclusive, though they are too few to afford any strong argument for his position. While the article as a whole is lucid and informing, the reader feels that the subject is too large to receive just and adequate treatment in the space which could be devoted to it in an article of twenty pages.